

**CPARB Fair Contracting Task Force Meeting Minutes February 10, 2009**

*Fair Contracting Meeting began at 11:25 AM.*

*Attending: Mark Riker, Miriam Moses, Neil Hartman, Terry Tilton, (Dave Johnson in hearing attended intermittently). By conference call: Vince Campanella, Ed Kommers, and Judy Jewell.*

Mark - clarified that a general contractor does not have to generate the certified payroll information, but request the information from their sub contractors who in turn request it from their sub contractors. If your supplier is in state, the information is simply passed on. A concern has been raised about getting the information back up the contractor chain of command that may be difficult.

Another concern is if a fabricator would not ordinarily list certified payrolls, their ability to track information may be impaired. Judy mentioned the concern even for in state contractors. Vince—Eastern Washington gets a lot of Idaho fabricated steel, they do not track or produce certified payroll records in Idaho. Mark—if they do prevailing wage projects, they should have the mechanism to produce the required information. Dave—the information could be recorded and submitted as time sheets, which are kept for regular business purposes. Concern for the need to educate contractors and sub contractors was raised.

If it restricts getting bids, there will be a problem in Eastern Washington where materials will be needed. Dave—this may be good timing, contractors are getting more bids from in State due to the economy. It is important to focus on a concise explanatory statement. Labor and Business should get together with L&I to cooperatively produce a straight forward explanatory statement, crafting the statement will be key to avoid misunderstanding. Judy—a sample form would be helpful when communicating to subcontractors. Ed—mechanical contractors have indicated that discouraging non prevailing wage pre-fab is a good concept but are concerned that the list is just the beginning of regulatory burdens and an effort that adds cost to projects that are already under competitive pressure.

What will happen with the bill?

Dave—the bill was just heard and should keep moving for the sake of the legislative process in hopes of striking an agreeable consensus. Dave would like to gain CPARB approval on Thursday, perhaps at least on the intent of the bill and ask that CPARB approve the concept.

We have some time to work on the bill before policy cutoffs.